

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed October 17, 2008, Applicants amended claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 13, 21 and 23, and added claims 28-41. Applicants present claims 1-4, 6-17 and 19-41 for examination.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Saurer, or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saurer in view of Fujimori and Feinberg. As amended, claims 1-4 and 6 require a substrate, a first electrode, an organic semiconductor layer, and a second electrode, where the first electrode is between the substrate and the organic semiconductor layer, the organic semiconductor layer is between the first and second electrodes, the substrate has a surface that is structured, and the first electrode has a planar surface. Saurer does not disclose or render obvious such subject matter, and neither Fujimori nor Feinberg, alone or in combination, cures Saurer's deficiencies. Thus, while Applicants do not concede that it would have been obvious (or even possible) to one skilled in the art to combine these references in the manner indicated by the Examiner, even if such a combination were made (if possible), the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 1-4 and 6. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-4, 6 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimori in view of Saurer. As amended, claims 1-4, 6 and 21 require a substrate, a first electrode, an organic semiconductor layer, and a second electrode, where the first electrode is between the substrate and the organic semiconductor layer, the organic semiconductor layer is between the first and second electrodes, the substrate has a surface that is structured, and the first electrode has a planar surface. Fujimori does not disclose or render obvious such subject matter, and Saurer does not cures Fujimori's deficiencies. Thus, while Applicants do not concede that it would have been obvious (or even possible) to one skilled in the art to combine these references in the manner indicated by the Examiner, even if such a combination were made (if possible), the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 1-4, 6 and 21. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-15 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Saurer, or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saurer in view of Nakamura, Fujimori, or Fujimori and Feinberg. As amended, claims 7-15 require a substrate having a structured surface, a first electrode, a second electrode, and an organic semiconductor between the first and second electrodes, where the first electrode is between the substrate, and the second electrode a surface of the first electrode is planar. Saurer does not disclose or render obvious such subject matter, and none of Nakamura, Fujimori, or Fujimori and Feinberg, alone or in combination, cures Saurer's deficiencies. Thus, while Applicants do not concede that it would have been obvious (or even possible) to one skilled in the art to combine these references in the manner indicated by the Examiner, even if such a combination were made (if possible), the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 7-15. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Examiner also rejected claims 7-15 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimori in view of Saurer, alone or further in view of Nakamura. As amended, claims 7-15 and 22 require a substrate having a structured surface, a first electrode, a second electrode, and an organic semiconductor between the first and second electrodes, where the first electrode is between the substrate, and the second electrode a surface of the first electrode is planar. Fujimori does not disclose or render obvious such subject matter, and neither Saurer nor Nakamura, alone or in combination, cures Fujimori's deficiencies. Thus, while Applicants do not concede that it would have been obvious (or even possible) to one skilled in the art to combine these references in the manner indicated by the Examiner, even if such a combination were made (if possible), the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 7-15 and 22. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Examiner also rejected claims 16, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimori in view of Shinohara. As amended, these claims require a substrate, a first electrode, a first layer, a second layer, a second electrode, and an organic semiconductor between the first and second electrodes, where the first layer is between the substrate and the first electrode, the second layer is between the substrate and the first electrode, the first electrode is

structured, a surface of the first layer is structured, a surface of the second layer is planar, and a surface of the organic semiconductor is planar. Fujimori does not disclose or render obvious such subject matter, and Shinohara does not cure Fujimori's deficiencies. Thus, while Applicants do not concede that it would have been obvious (or even possible) to one skilled in the art to combine these references in the manner indicated by the Examiner, even if such a combination were made (if possible), the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 16, 17 and 20. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 23-25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimori in view of Saurer, alone or further in view of Shinohara. As amended, these claims require a substrate having a surface, a support layer having a surface, a first electrode, a second electrode, and an organic semiconductor between the first and second electrodes, where the support layer being between the substrate and the first electrode, the first electrode is between the support layer and the organic semiconductor, a surface of the organic semiconductor is planar, at least one surface is structured, and the at least one surface is selected from the group consisting of the surface of the substrate and the surface of the support layer. Fujimori does not disclose or render obvious such subject matter, and Saurer does not cure Fujimori's deficiencies. Thus, while Applicants do not concede that it would have been obvious (or even possible) to one skilled in the art to combine these references in the manner indicated by the Examiner, even if such a combination were made (if possible), the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 23-25 and 27. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimori in view of Shinohara, alone or further in view of Saurer. As amended, these claims require a substrate having a surface, a support layer having a surface, a first electrode, a second electrode, and an organic semiconductor between the first and second electrodes, where the support layer being between the substrate and the first electrode, the first electrode is between the support layer and the organic semiconductor, a surface of the organic semiconductor is planar, at least one surface is structured, and the at least one surface is selected from the group consisting

of the surface of the substrate and the surface of the support layer. Fujimori does not disclose or render obvious such subject matter, and neither Shinohara nor Saurer, alone or in combination, cures Fujimori's deficiencies. Thus, while Applicants do not concede that it would have been obvious (or even possible) to one skilled in the art to combine these references in the manner indicated by the Examiner, even if such a combination were made (if possible), the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 23-26. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The fees for excess claims in the amount of \$1,284.00 are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 21928-0017US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 31, 2008

/Sean P. Daley/

Sean P. Daley
Reg. No. 40,978

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945